

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/593,629	CAMERON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Q. Janice Li	1632	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Q. Janice Li, PTO. (3) _____

(2) Glenn P. Ladwig, Appl. Rep. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 9/25, 9/29/03.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 50,52,54-58 and 60.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hardley et al.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: On 9/25/03, Mr. Ladwig called to discuss the after final response. The Examiner indicated that claims drawn to a method of transplantation will stand rejected because they encompass the germ cells taught by Hardley et al as the therapeutic cells in the biochamber. Even though Hardley et al did not explicitly teach transplantation of the sertoli cell and germ cell complex, the study is for successfully culturing germ cells ex vivo, and it indicates the motivation for transplantation of germ cells for therapeutic purpose. Mr. Ladwig agreed to discuss the issue with the applicants. On 9/29/03, Mr. Ladwig called to authorize the Examiner's amendment for amending claim 50 and dependent claims limiting the type of therapeutic cells in the biochamber .